



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/564,934

01/13/2006

Jean-Marie Poulet

CAB-17902

5171

40854 7590 03/17/2009

RANKIN, HILL & CLARK LLP

38210 Glenn Avenue

WILLOUGHBY, OH 44094-7808

EXAMINER

AHVAZI, BIJAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/564,934	Applicant(s) POULET ET AL.	
	Examiner Bijan Ahvazi	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 and 37-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10,33-35,37-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-32, 39-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on January 19, 2009.
2. Claims 11-32, 39-57 are pending. Claims 11, 14, 17-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 30, 31 are amended. Claims 39-57 are newly added.
3. The objection of claim 11 because of minor informalities is withdrawn in view of the Applicant's amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 17-19, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter is withdrawn in view of the Applicant's amendment.
5. The rejection of claims 23, 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable is withdrawn in view of the Applicant's amendment.
6. The rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being an insufficient antecedent basis is withdrawn in view of the Applicant's amendment.
7. Claims 11-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maze *et al.* (WO 02/38686 A2) in view of Jung *et al.* (Pub. No. US 2004/0062873 A1), even in view of the Applicant's amendment.
8. Applicant's arguments filed on January 19, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1796

Claim Objections

9. Claim 24 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 51. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim 24 has not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 11-32 and 39-41, 43-51 and 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maze *et al.* (WO 02/38686 A2) in view of Jung *et al.* (Pub. No. US 2004/0062873 A1).

Maze *et al.* disclose an anti-corrosion coating composition for metal parts, characterized in that it comprises: at least one particulate metal; an organic solvent; a thickener; a silane-based binder, preferably carrying epoxy functional groups; molybdenum oxide (MoO₃); possibly a silicate of sodium, potassium or lithium, and; water (Page 3, lines 10-20) wherein the content of molybdenum oxide MoO₃ is preferably between 0.5 and 7% and even more preferably in the region of 2% by weight of the total composition (Page 3, line 23) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 11,12 and 13. The particulate metal present in the composition may be chosen from zinc, aluminium, chromium, manganese, nickel, titanium, their alloys and

Art Unit: 1796

intermetallic compounds, and mixtures thereof (Page 3, lines 26-30). Advantageously, the particulate metal content is between 10% and 40% by weight of metal with respect to the weight of the composition (Page 3, line 36) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 14, 15 and 16. Such a composition also makes use of a binder, preferably an organofunctional silane, used in an amount of 3% to 20% by weight (Page 4, line 34) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claim 22. The organofunctionality can be represented by vinyl, methacryloxy and amino, but is preferably epoxy functional for enhanced coating performance as well as composition stability. The silane is advantageously easily dispersible in aqueous medium, and is preferably soluble in such medium (Page 4, line 35) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 23, 50 and 51. Preferably, the useful silane is an epoxy functional silane such as β -(3, 4-epoxycyclohexyl) ethyltrimethoxysilane, 4-(trimethoxysilyl) butane-1, 2 epoxide or γ -glycidoxypropyl- trimethoxysilane (Page 5, line 3) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claim 24. The anti-corrosion coating compositions may also contain, in addition to the organic solvent such as a glycol ether, in particular diethylene glycol, triethylene glycol and dipropylene glycol (Page 4, line 18), up to a maximum amount of approximately 10% by weight of white spirit so as to improve the ability of the anti-corrosion compositions to be applied to the metal parts by spraying, dipping or dip-spinning (Page 5, line 7) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 25, 46, 47 and 48. Advantageously, the composition may also contain a silicate of sodium, potassium or lithium, preferably in an amount comprised between 0.05 % to 0.5 % by weight (Page 5, line 14), with the disclosed features % by weight as discussed above corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 30 and 49.

According to another embodiment, the anti-corrosion composition also contains from 0.005% to 2% by weight of a thickening agent (reads on up to 7% by weight of the instant applicants), in particular of a cellulose derivative, more particularly hydroxymethylcellulose,

Art Unit: 1796

hydroxyethylcellulose, hydroxypropylcellulose, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose, xanthan gum or an associative thickener of the polyurethane or acrylic type (Page 4, lines 21-27) and possibly a silicate of sodium, potassium or lithium, and; water (Page 3, lines 10-20) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 26, 27, 53, 54, 55 and 56. Maze *et al.* further disclose the standard reference GEOMET® composition in Example 1 corresponds to 0.65% of a weak mineral such as boric acid, 0.4% of Schwego Foam® (emulsified antifoam), and 0.53% of Aerosol® TR70 (an anionic surfactant) (Page 8, line 20) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 29, 31, 32 and 57. However, Maze *et al.* fail to disclose a reinforcing agent for the anticorrosion properties of the composition selected from the group consisting of yttrium, zirconium, lanthanum, cerium, praseodymium and neodymium, in the form of oxides or salts and a lubricating agent to obtain a self-lubricated system selected from the group consisting of polyethylene, MoS₂, graphite, polysulfones, polytetrafluoroethylene, synthetic or natural waxes and nitrides, and their mixtures.

Jung *et al.* disclose method of coating metallic surfaces and also to the use of the coated substrates produced in particular in vehicle construction, especially in the line manufacture of automobiles, and for the production of components or bodywork parts or premounted elements in the vehicle, air travel or space travel industry (Page 1, ¶0001). The anticorrosion layer(s) ought to be readily formable together with the paint or a paintlike layer and ought also to exhibit, after forming, effective corrosion protection and effective paint adhesion. Additionally, depending on the joining technique, it may be necessary for said layer(s) to be readily clinchable as well without showing a greater tendency toward corrosion as a result (Page 1, ¶0003). Jung *et al.* disclose a method of coating a metallic strip, the strip, or where appropriate strip sections produced from it, in the subsequent operation being first coated with at least one

Art Unit: 1796

anticorrosion layer and then with at least one layer of a paintlike, polymer-containing layer, the strip, after coating with at least one anticorrosion layer or after coating with at least one layer of a paintlike coating, being divided into strip sections, the coated strip sections then being formed, joined and/or coated with at least one (further) paintlike layer and/or paint layer, the paintlike coating being formed by coating the surface with an aqueous dispersion which comprises besides water a) at least one organic film former comprising at least one water-soluble or water-dispersed polymer having an acid number in the range from 5 to 200, b) at least one inorganic compound in particle form, having an average particle diameter, and c) at least one lubricant and/or at least one corrosion inhibitor, the metallic surface coated with at least one anticorrosion layer being contacted with the aqueous composition and a particle-containing film being formed on the metallic surface, and subsequently dried and, as the case may be, additionally cured, the dried and, as the case may be, additionally cured film having a thickness in the range from 0.01 to 10 μm (Page 32, Claim1).

Jung *et al.* utilize the inorganic compound in particle form that is added is a finely divided powder, a dispersion or a suspension, such as, for example, a carbonate, an oxide, a silicate or a sulfate, especially colloidal and/or amorphous particles. With particular preference the inorganic compound in particle form comprises particles based on at least one compound of lanthanum, of silicon, of titanium, of yttrium, of zinc and/or of zirconium, especially particles based on alumina, barium sulfate, cerium dioxide (reads on cerium oxide or CeO_2), silica, silicate, titanium oxide, yttrium oxide (reads on Y_2O_3), zinc oxide and/or zirconium oxide (reads on ZrO_2) (Page 5, ¶0043) in an amount of in the range from 0.1 to 80 g/L, more preferably in an amount in the range from 1 to 50 g/L, very preferably in an amount in the range from 2 to 30 g/L (Page 34, Claim 59) wherein inorganic compound is characterized in that the aqueous composition comprises from 0.1 to 500 g/L (reads on the same % by weight of the instant

Art Unit: 1796

applicants) of the at least one inorganic compound in particle form (Page 33, Claim 24), which corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claims 11, 17, 18, 41, 19, 20, 39 and 40. Jung *et al.* further disclose to add as a lubricant, which may also serve as a forming agent, at least one wax selected from the group consisting of paraffins, polyethylenes, and polypropylenes, especially an oxidized wax (Page 5, ¶0045) corresponding to the instant applicants' limitation claim 28.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an anti-corrosion coating composition for metal parts by Maze *et al.* with a reinforcing agent for the anticorrosion properties of the composition as taught by Jung *et al.* in order to improve the anti-corrosion properties of parts treated without using a composition based on reinforcing agent in the formulation of the coatings with less toxic risk and less adverse consequences for the environment. Since it is held that it is ***prima facie*** obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding the composition wherein said reinforcing agent for the anticorrosion properties of the composition is associated with molybdenum oxide MoO_3 in a weight proportion of $0.25 < \text{anticorrosion property reinforcing agent} : \text{MoO}_3 < 20$, preferably $0.5 < \text{anticorrosion property reinforcing agent} : \text{MoO}_3 < 16$, further preferably $0.5 < \text{anticorrosion property reinforcing agent} : \text{MoO}_3 < 14$, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since it held that a particular parameter must first be recognized as a result-effective variable, i.e., a variable which achieves a recognized result, before the determination of the optimum or workable

Art Unit: 1796

ranges of said variable might be characterized as routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977).

Regarding the recited ranges in the instant applicants' limitation claims, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since it has been held that choosing the overlapping portion, of the range taught in the prior art and the range claimed by the applicant, has been held to be a ***prima facie*** case of obviousness, see *In re Malagari*, 182 USPQ 549.

12. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maze *et al.* (WO 02/38686 A2) and Jung *et al.* (Pub. No. US 2004/0062873 A1) as applied to claims 11-32 and 39-41, 43-51 and 53-57 above and further in view of Robert N. Miller (Pat. No. US 5,399,210).

13. Maze *et al.* and Jung *et al.* disclose the features as discussed above. However, Maze *et al.* and Jung *et al.* do not expressly disclose that the composition, wherein said reinforcing agent is cerium in the form of cerium chloride. Robert N. Miller discloses the use of CeCl_3 (Col. 4, line 39 & lines 46) in coating for the corrosion protection of aluminum or aluminum alloy (Col. 1, lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an anti-corrosion coating composition for metal parts by Maze *et al.* with a reinforcing agent for the anticorrosion properties of the composition by Jung *et al.* with mixture of solution including CeCl_3 as taught by Miller in order provide a non-toxic corrosion coating composition in which the coating is resistant to wetting and the penetration of moisture but has a controlled surface energy which is low enough to repel moisture while high enough to

Art Unit: 1796

permit wetting and good adhesion by solvent-based paint. Since it is held that it is ***prima facie*** obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.” *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

14. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maze *et al.* (WO 02/38686 A2) and Jung *et al.* (Pub. No. US 2004/0062873 A1) as applied to claims 11-32 and 39-41, 43-51 and 53-57 above and further in view of Phillips *et al.* (Pat. No. US 5,250,325).

15. Maze *et al.* and Jung *et al.* disclose the features as discussed above. However, Maze *et al.* and Jung *et al.* do not expressly disclose that the composition, wherein the binder is associated with a phenolic cross-linking agent or an aminoplastic cross-linking agent. Phillips *et al.* disclose coating compositions containing certain alkanolic acid salts, as corrosion inhibitors; as well as those alkanolic acid salts which are novel (Col. 1, lines 4-7). Preferred adducts of an epoxide resin with an amine are adducts of a polyglycidyl ether, which may be of a polyhydric phenol or a polyhydric alcohol, with a monoamine. Suitable polyglycidyl ethers include those of dihydric alcohols such as butane-1, 4-diol, neopentyl glycol, hexamethylene glycol, oxyalkylene glycols and polyoxyalkylene glycols, and tri-hydric alcohols such as glycerol, 1,1,1-trimethylolpropane and adducts of these alcohols with ethylene oxide or propylene oxide (Col. 6, lines 60-68). It will be understood by those skilled in the art that these polyglycidyl ethers of polyhydric alcohols are usually advanced, i.e. converted into longer chain higher molecular weight polyglycidyl ethers, for example by reaction with a dihydric alcohol or phenol, so that the resulting polyglycidyl ethers give adducts with suitable electrodepositable

Art Unit: 1796

film-forming properties on reaction with the secondary monoamine. Preferred polyglycidyl ethers are those of polyhydric phenols, including bisphenols such as bisphenol F, bisphenol A and tetrabromobisphenol A and phenolic novolak resins such as phenol-formaldehyde or cresol-formaldehyde novolak resins. These polyglycidyl ethers of phenols may have been advanced, for example by reaction with dihydric alcohols or phenols such as those described. Particularly preferred polyglycidyl ethers are polyglycidyl ethers of bisphenol A advanced by reaction with bisphenol A (Col. 7, lines 1-18). Monoamines suitable for adduct formation with the polyglycidyl ethers include primary, secondary or tertiary amines. Secondary amines are preferred e.g. dialkylamines such as diethylamine, di-n-propylamine, di-isopropylamine, di-n-butylamine, di-n-octylamine and di-n-dodecylamine or nitrogen heterocycles such as piperidine or morpholine (Col. 7, lines 19-24).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an anti-corrosion coating composition for metal parts by Maze *et al.* with a reinforcing agent for the anticorrosion properties of the composition by Jung *et al.* with a phenolic or aminoplastic cross-linking agents as taught by Phillips *et al.* in order provide improve the anti-corrosion properties of parts treated without using a composition based on reinforcing agent in the formulation of the coatings with less toxic risk and less adverse consequences for the environment. Since it is held that it is ***prima facie*** obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

Art Unit: 1796

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 01/29/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's argue that June *et al.* entirely fails to teach or even suggest the specific choice of yttrium, zirconium, lanthanum, and cerium....in form of oxides or salts (pae 16, line 4).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. June *et al.* teach with particular preference the inorganic compound in particle form comprises particles based on at least one compound of lanthanum, of silicon, of titanium, of yttrium, of zinc and/or of zirconium, especially particles based on alumina, barium sulfate, cerium dioxide (reads on cerium oxide or CeO_2), silica, silicate, titanium oxide, yttrium oxide (reads on Y_2O_3), zinc oxide and/or zirconium oxide (reads on ZrO_2) (Page 5, ¶0043). Thus, June *et al.* clear teach the recited claim.

In response to the applicants' argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, June *et al.* teach the anticorrosion layer(s) ought to be readily formable together with the paint or a paintlike layer and ought also to exhibit, after forming, effective corrosion protection and effective paint adhesion. Additionally, depending on the joining technique, it may be necessary for said layer(s) to be readily clinchable as well without showing a greater tendency toward corrosion as a result (Page 1, ¶0003). Since it is held that it is **prima facie** obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful

Art Unit: 1796

for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art.” *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

In response to applicant's argument that June *et al.* reference is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as mentioned above, Jung *et al.* disclose a method of coating a metallic strip, the strip, or where appropriate strip sections produced from it, in the subsequent operation being first coated with at least one anticorrosion layer and then with at least one layer of a paintlike, polymer-containing layer. The combination of Maze *et al.* and Jung *et al.* teach the same composition as claimed. If there is any difference between the product of Maze *et al.* and Jung *et al.* and the product of the instant claims, the difference would have been minor and obvious. It is held that “Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties.” A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. See MPEP 2112.01(I), *In re Best*, 562 F.2d at 1255, 195 USPQ at 433, *Titanium Metals Corp v Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed Cir 1985), *In re Ludtke*, 441 F.2d 660, 169 USPQ 563 (CCPA 1971) and *Northam Warren Corp v D F Newfield Co*, 7 F Supp 773, 22 USPQ 313 (EDNY 1934).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on

Art Unit: 1796

obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner Information

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bijan Ahvazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571)270-3449. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:0-5:0. (Off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 1796

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BA/
Bijan Ahvazi,
Examiner
Art Unit 1796

/Ling-Siu Choi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

09/16/2008